

County Administrator's Budget Message

Introduction

The County Administrator and Staff are pleased to present to the Board of County Commissioners and the citizens of Monroe County the Budget for the coming fiscal year. This budget includes not only the results of the efforts of people throughout the County Administration, but also similar efforts by the Constitutional Officers, with policy guidance and instructions from the Board of County Commissioners.

The County has continued with its process toward more professionalized and refined budget preparation and adoption. In previous years, the review process has progressed from one of line by line detail to one of the Board of County Commissioners dealing with policies and trends so that the budget discussions could truly become a clear indication of where the Board of County Commissioners wishes to place its priorities.

This year, as approved by the Board of County Commissioners at the special meeting on February 27, 2003, the budget is presented in a new format. This step forward shows much more clearly the relationships among revenue sources, expenditures and personnel. The Board of County Commissioners will be able to see at one time how these fit together for the various divisions and departments. The budget, by its very nature, is the implementing document for the series of policies and programs that the County will pursue. Recognition of improvement and professionalism in the County's budget was provided by the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA), granting the County its Distinguished Budget Presentation Award for fiscal year 1999, fiscal year 2000, fiscal year 2001, fiscal year 2002, and fiscal year 2003.

During fiscal year 2003, there developed and continued many major issues that will have direct impacts upon the fiscal year 2004 budget and the tax rates for the various taxing districts. In Monroe County there is a tendency to dwell upon the more controversial issues, forgetting that most of what the County government does on a daily basis it does well, quietly, and without controversy. The proposed budget for fiscal year 2004 reflects the continuation of effective services, as well as responding to the more controversial issues and major challenges pertaining to state and federal funding and state mandated local government cost increases.

- The budget, tax table and millage table reflect the split of the Sheriff's budget into countywide and municipal policing functions, which occurred first in the fiscal year 2001 budget.
- The budget reflects the requirement that the Tourist Development Council provide thirty percent of revenues toward infrastructure costs.
- The budget responds to the instructions of the Board of County Commissioners to utilize fund balances according to policies established by the BOCC.
- The budget addresses the issues of employee compensation in conjunction with instructions from the Board of County Commissioners on February 27, 2003.
- The budget responds to the challenge of the rapidly increasing cost of the group benefits program.
- The budget feels the impacts of and responds to the aftermath of the tragic events of September 11, 2001, and the continuing significant loss of revenue from lower interest rates.
- The budget continues the streamlining of that portion of County government under the Board of County Commissioners, which initially occurred during the reorganization and downsizing period in fiscal years 2000 and 2001.
- The budget includes the County's continued support for human services and social services provided by community based organizations.
- The budget responds to state mandated cost increases, especially pertaining to retirement contributions for all classes of eligible County employees.
- The budget includes funds set aside to implement the second year of the settlement in the Shadek litigation.

County Administrator's Budget Message

- The budget responds to the initial impact of the state government's Revision 7 to Article 5 of the Florida Constitution. Final costs and revenues for this fiscal year may not be known until the 2004 legislative session is completed.
- The budget maintains a consistent funding level for Fire/Rescue/EMS services. Although there are additional needs in this area, it is projected that the combination of budget authority and equipment funding in the infrastructure sales tax account will be sufficient until additional future funding can be made available.
- The tax implications of the budget are presented in two separate millage sheets. The first reflects the impact of the budget and the instructions from the Board of County Commissioners (the aggregate percentage increase over roll-back is within 2.4% as instructed by the BOCC.) The second millage sheet shows the impact of the addition of five special taxing districts for wastewater purposes. This brings the percent over roll-back to approximately 5.6%. These districts were adopted subsequent to the Commission's instructions in February of 2003.

Budget Themes

The fiscal year 2004 budget is a continuation and reflection of advances made in previous years that stabilized what had previously been difficult situations in some of the funds. The policy established by the Board of County Commissioners in reference to fund balances has served to provide predictability to the availability of funds to respond to general needs and problem areas. Budget revenues will hopefully return to more traditional patterns and levels in the future.

- The Board will recall that there has been a continued improvement in the stability of the funds. The events of this past year have put a strain on many funds. The necessity to put aside funds for the Shadek settlement and continued low interest rates have tightened up the ability for many funds to be flexible in terms of addressing County needs.
- The budget, of necessity, attempts to respond to major changes. Some of these are as a result of the decisions of the Board of County Commissioners and others are outside influences. The Board in the past developed policy decisions in reference to the splitting of the Sheriff's millages, the utilization of Tourist Development Council funds, the appropriation of fund balances, and adjustments to the group benefits program, with additional changes projected for this year.
- The budget reflects the County's continuing commitment to reduce the size of its work force through an attrition program. In addition there is a clear recognition of the attempt to control costs and to continue to provide and improve the level of services to the citizens, within the context of limited funding.

This budget continues the progress made in various areas in previous years. As was discussed in previous budget messages, the budget presents a balanced picture of the need for fiscal conservatism and the desire on the part of the citizens for services. As in past years, a number of other themes are prevalent in the budget. Many of these will be familiar to the Board of County Commissioners since they have been major influences in the budgets for years.

- The budget responds to outside pressures that have a major impact upon the County's finances. This includes the cost of property insurance as well as the necessity of complying with federal mandates such as the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Family and Medical Leave Act, Federal Department of Transportation Drug/Alcohol Program requirements, Occupational Safety and Health Administration requirements, etc.
- The budget represents changes made to the group insurance program by the Board of County Commissioners. It also reflects the growing cost of the group benefits program and the need for adequate funding of those services. Review of the recent experiences of other public agencies in the County indicates similar difficulties and rapidly increasing costs. Reference to media reports

County Administrator's Budget Message

suggests that what Monroe County is experiencing with its group benefits program is occurring throughout the country and that private and public entities are wrestling with the same problems. Two years ago, at the instruction of the Board of County Commissioners, the County sought responses to bids for all parts of the County's program and the entire package. County consultants attempted to market the program directly to the private sector. None of the responses were substantial enough to change the program. As major impacts continue, the BOCC may wish to provide another bid opportunity. In addition, the County will apply to the new state sponsored special risk pool for health benefits when applications are available.

- The budget represents continued stability in the workers' compensation fund and responds to cost changes in the risk management fund. State legislation changes are expected to have a substantial impact on the workers' compensation fund in the future.
- The budget continues to respond to mandates upon the County government. One of the major ones is the detention facility on Stock Island and the need to maintain and protect that huge investment. Maintenance and operations are identified in both the County Administration and the Sheriff's budgets.
- The budget continues to respond to the Board of County Commissioners' policy of expanding park and recreational facilities. There are proposals for the increase in maintenance as well as upgrading existing parks, including children's playground equipment. As a result of decisions made in reference to the operation of the Upper Keys Community Pool, the Board of County Commissioners found it necessary to fund a Contract with the YMCA to operate the balance of the Key Largo Community Park. Funding in the amount of \$40,765 is included in the budget. The fiscal year 2005 budget will need to include cost increases for the maintenance of the new Big Pine Park.
- The budget responds to ongoing daily services provided to citizens. There are increases and improvements in many of these services, especially parks and recreation, libraries, and growth management.
- The budget continues to respond to major long range initiatives and policies adopted by the Board of County Commissioners, including the implementation of the Comprehensive Plan, the Livable CommuniKeys Program, the preparation of new land development regulations, implementation of wastewater treatment programs, affordable housing, and the activities necessary to comply with the Administration Commission's new work program. The cost of compliance with the requirements of the Carrying Capacity Study will need to be shared with other governmental levels.
- The County, through this budget, is also prepared to continue with enforcement of the revised flood insurance program as agreed to by the Federal Emergency Management Agency.
- The budget responds to compensation policies established by the Board of County Commissioners. In fiscal years 2000 and 2001, a merit program was funded and implemented. In fiscal years 2002 and 2003, the Board of County Commissioners established an across the board compensation level for all County employees including those under the Constitutional Officers (7% for 2002 and 4% for 2003.) In addition, the Board approved a Recruitment and Retention Program. The combination of these items has substantially reduced turnover in those areas under the Board of County Commissioners. In February of 2003, the Board of County Commissioners instructed the Administration to prepare the proposed fiscal year 2004 budget with a 2.4% compensation increase for all County employees. Constitutional Officers determine compensation levels for their employees within the amounts provided by the Board.
- The new budget format is designed to provide more focus on major issues as a result of reviewing executive level reports. These are included in the budget binder. In addition, the format allows the Board and public more easily to see the relationships among revenues, expenditures, and

County Administrator's Budget Message

personnel for each part of the government. The budget is prepared according to professional guidelines provided by the Government Finance Officers Association.

- The budget includes some costs that the Board of County Commissioners may wish to approve as a result of negotiations with the International Association of Firefighters, which represents the County's Fire/Rescue/EMS employees. Results of those negotiations will be presented to the Board of County Commissioners in the near future.
- Although the budget responds very clearly to the continuing commitment of the Board of County Commissioners to fund human service and social service agencies in the community through the work of the Human Services Advisory Board, there are other requests from community organizations for additional funding. Some of these are included as they have been historically within the budget document. Others will be listed as outside requests to be considered by the Board of County Commissioners.

This budget addresses many major issues in the County. It, therefore, is a document that will engender policy discussions by the Board of County Commissioners and clear guidance to the Administration. If there is one theme that is prevalent throughout the entire budget, it is that the County has established a strong financial position which will enable it to traverse more difficult economic times, and consider major issues while it continues to provide services to the citizens. The Board of County Commissioners should not lose sight of the fact that some overriding issues will tend to draw attention away from the substantial advances made over the last few years.

Budget Format

At the meeting of the Board of County Commissioners on February 27, 2003, the Board and the Administration discussed a new format for budget presentation. The Board approved a format which was used previously and successfully by other counties. This is a major step forward.

The Board of County Commissioners and the public should refer to the one page Budget Format description inserted in the front pocket of the Budget notebook.

Challenges Addressed

It seems as though many of the challenges faced by Monroe County Government are present each year. Some of the items discussed below have been discussed in previous budget messages and substantial progress has been made. However, they have a major impact on the overall budget each year and need to be identified as ongoing activities. Some of the other items discussed are new and can be handled in one budget year. It is hoped that in addressing these major challenges the Board can see that each budget does not exist by itself but, rather, is another step in a continuing effort to provide and to improve services to the citizens, at this time within very serious economic constraints.

Employee Compensation – The County has wrestled with the issue of fair and equitable employee compensation and its relationship to productivity and the quality of service. During fiscal year 1999, the Administration presented to the Board of County Commissioners a series of proposals for moving forward not only employee compensation but also the downsizing of the work force and the improvement of productivity. The Board agreed to those proposals as the beginning of a multi-year program. They were implemented in fiscal year 2000 and continued successfully in fiscal years 2001-2003. Also, in fiscal year 2001 the Board agreed to adjust the salary ranges for the positions under its jurisdiction to reflect three years of consumer price index increases. Fiscal year 2002 continued with a stable workforce (no major increases or decreases). Also, the Board of County Commissioners authorized a recruitment and retention program, which has helped to reduce turnover from near 20% per year to under 12% for the last full calendar year. As this Budget Message is being prepared, turnover currently is running at a more acceptable 7%.

The Administration continues an attrition program with the goal of reducing the workforce without layoffs and reassigning work and responsibilities to improve productivity. Originally conceived as a response to the potential for layoffs as a result of the proposed incorporations, the attrition program has now become a part of reforming the manner in which County work is assigned. The program has shown signs of streamlining some County operations while reducing the number of employees. The proposed fiscal year 2004 budget has a net

County Administrator's Budget Message

reduction of 7.26 positions for those areas directly under the control of the Board of County Commissioners and a total net increase of 14.00 positions for other areas of County government. From fiscal year 1998 to proposed fiscal year 2004, the number of positions under the BOCC has decreased from 623 to 492 (21%). This has included both County-wide and municipal services.

In February of 2003, the Board of County Commissioners instructed the Administration to provide a 2.4% across the board increase for all County employees.

It should be noted that the Constitutional Officers are responsible for conducting their compensation programs within the funds provided by the BOCC.

Group Benefits Program – The County has made major strides over the last few years in correcting the previous problems associated with the group benefits program and its fund. Previously the fund had been stabilized and strengthened, and the program changed third party administrators and the efficiency and effectiveness with which claims are handled. The response from employees has been very positive over the last few years.

In March of 2001, the Board of County Commissioners met to review the increasing costs in the group benefits program. Presentations by the County's health insurance consultants, Walgreens Health Plan representatives, Keys Physician Hospital Alliance and staff served to point out the growing problems. The Board of County Commissioners wrestled with many of the issues, including changes that would impact employees, dependents, and retirees and made some adjustments to the program. The cost savings of those adjustments are estimated to be between \$400,000 – \$500,000 per year.

The Board should be aware that the group benefits program includes not only health care but also dental, vision and pharmaceutical card coverage as well as an Employee Assistance Program and life insurance for participants. The costs of all of these are included under the premium paid by the County on behalf of the active employees and the subsidized premium paid for retirees and dependents. There is no premium paid by retirees for their coverage nor is the amount paid on behalf of dependents sufficient to cover their costs. The result is that the great majority of program costs are paid by the Board of County Commissioners through the internal premium funding process, which is supported approximately 77% by ad valorem taxation.

It should also be recognized that the program covers not only the approximate 500 employees under the Board of County Commissioners but also 791 employees under the Sheriff and other Constitutional Officers and 894 dependents of all those employees and retirees. There are approximately 299 retirees covered under the program. When the Board of County Commissioners first instituted retiree coverage in 1988, there were only 12 retirees. The growth in that number, as well as the growth in health care costs, dependents' subsidy, pharmaceutical costs, major cases, etc., etc., etc. have contributed to a rapidly growing group benefits program.

In its deliberations over the years, the Board of County Commissioners has been most sensitive to the needs of employees, retirees and dependents. The County has been slow to increase dependent contributions recognizing the direct impact upon employee take home pay, especially for more moderate income workers. It has also been of great concern that retirees felt they were irrevocably entitled to free health care after retirement, even though that is not borne out by the policies that have been in place. In the past, each time there has been a discussion of the group benefits program, the Board of County Commissioners has decided either to do little in the way of major change and thereby assume the growing costs or, as in March, 2001, has made some significant changes which balanced the needs of the program and the County with the covered individuals. The Board of County Commissioners is aware of the continuing problem, even as we are reading about it affecting other governments and the private sector all over the country.

It should also be noted that the Administration has kept track of what the other public agencies have been doing over the last few years. Most of this has been reported to the Board of County Commissioners. The School Board, Aqueduct Authority, City Electric (Keys Energy Services) and others have made changes in how their programs operate. The County finds itself in a period in which it should review the program every year and make adjustments.

The Board has also been kept informed of changes previously proposed and now under review for adoption by the Government Accounting Standards Board (GASB). It became necessary to review the group benefits program, especially the free health care for retirees portion, to reduce what was an approximate \$65 million dollar unfunded liability. Changes made in 1999 by the Board of County Commissioners in reference to eligibility for the

County Administrator's Budget Message

retiree benefit reduced that level to approximately \$26 million dollars. However, the County has experienced a major increase in the number of retirees, presently 299, and the trend continues. The County's consultant has indicated that the exposure has risen substantially to \$90 million.

In April of 2003, the Board of County Commissioners considered the entire group insurance program and the need for reducing costs substantially in adjusting the manner in which parts of the program were funded. The Board decided to adjust the deductible, the medical co-pay and out of pocket limit, the pharmaceutical program, the dependent subsidy, retiree contributions, and some other specific service level benefits. In addition, the Board decided that the vision and dental parts of the program should be provided separately with payroll deduction by the employees as they deem appropriate for their personal situations. The overall change was a savings of approximately \$3.8 million, approximately \$3 million of which was ad valorem taxation.

Since that time, members of the Board of County Commissioners have been concerned about the overall impact of some of the changes. There will be a section of the agenda for the budget workshops in July to give the Board an opportunity to discuss whether it wishes to make any further adjustments.

Comprehensive Plan – When the 2010 Comprehensive Plan took effect in July of 1997, the County turned its attention to implementation. Much has transpired since then and the County has been funding significant parts of that implementation.

In 1999 the Governor and Cabinet, sitting as the Administration Commission, adopted a new multi-year work program and required the County, in conjunction with a variety of other agencies, to meet certain goals over the life of the work program. In the recent years, the County has made substantial strides. Fiscal year 2004's budget includes \$270,000 for Comprehensive Plan implementation. This is a lower amount than previous years and reflects the completion of major aspects of the implementation including the wastewater master plan and the storm water master plan. The general work associated with the wastewater program has been funded. The capital costs are being handled mostly through the capital program. During the current year, the Board decided to establish five new taxing districts to raise wastewater funds. These numbers are included in the budget figures and on the second millage sheet.

A major effort during the year in reference to implementing and improving the Comprehensive Plan will be the continuation of the Livable CommuniKeys Program. This will continue on Big Pine Key in conjunction with the habitat conservation program and the countywide carrying capacity study. There are program areas for Stock Island and two additional areas in the Lower Keys from Little Torch to Sugarloaf and Rockland to Saddlebunch. In the Upper Keys there will be an ongoing Livable CommuniKeys Program in Key Largo and Tavernier.

Human Service Organizations – During the budget discussions in February, the Board of County Commissioners reviewed the level of funding available to the Human Services Advisory Board. The BOCC determined to leave that funding at the current year's level, \$1,064,950.

During fiscal year 2002, the Board established a committee with the overall responsibility of looking at how the County handles the funding of community-based human service and social service organizations. That committee was chaired by Commissioner Spehar and brought to the Board of County Commissioners a plan for change which ultimately was adopted by the Board with instructions to the Human Service Advisory Board for it to proceed with those changed policies and categories of services for preparation of this year's recommendations to the BOCC. Those policies are still in place.

The Human Services Advisory Board did as requested and submitted back to the Board such proposals. Part of the proposal was to have those agencies that provide statutorily mandated services to come directly to the Board of County Commissioners. Those are listed within the budget as stand alone requests.

However, the issue does not stop there. In the Budget Messages for the proposed fiscal year 2002 and 2003 budgets, the following statement appears:

It must also be noted with some concern that the BOCC is being approached more frequently by outside organizations to increase their grants or to make up for cutbacks by state and federal programs. This makes the County the "payor of last resort" at the same time the County's state and federal funds are being reduced, especially for social services, employment training, and youth programs. The BOCC should consider a policy for dealing with this situation.

County Administrator's Budget Message

What has been happening has been happening for many years. Under the philosophy of devolving power back to the states, the federal government has provided states with additional responsibilities for programming and has sent less money to support the programs. Likewise, the states have been moving many programs, especially in the human and social service category, back to local communities with less funding support than previously. Since the problems in the community continue to exist, local government frequently becomes the last refuge for organizations that want to provide services to the community.

In a separate package, there is some information in reference to Human and Social Services funding proposals. There is a table prepared on behalf of the Human Services Advisory Board which shows the amounts awarded for fiscal year 2003 and the requests from organizations for fiscal year 2004 funding. Please note that the requests are approximately \$401,000 over the amount determined by the Board of County Commissioners. The figure of \$1,064,950, as determined by the BOCC, is included in the proposed budget as a gross number for these purposes. The final recommendations from the HSAB will not be available to the Board until the HSAB meets, has presentations by the applicants, and votes on the proposed funding distribution. That will be at the end of July. The specifics can then be included within the proposed budget for the September public hearings.

In addition to those programs funded through the Human Services Advisory Board, other organizations come directly to the Board of County Commissioners for their funding level. Included in the attached package is a request from the Rural Health Network of Monroe County for another \$150,000 grant to continue its primary care program. There is also a request from the Childrens Shelter for approximately \$200,000 to replace funding that has been lost over the last couple of years.

In addition, the Big Pine Athletic Association did not request funding through the Human Service Advisory Board. They are requesting funding directly from the Board of County Commissioners as a stand alone service. This may be in anticipation of the need to have an organization assist in the management of the soon to be developed Big Pine Key community park.

On July 11, 2003, the County received from the Florida Department of Health a funding request for the coming fiscal year. Since the County had not previously heard from the Department of Health, it had included the figure of \$296,960 on the millage sheet, which is a 2.4% increase over the amount for the current year. The Department of Health is making the following request:

1. The County tax levy should be \$305,660, a 5.4% increase.
2. The Small Quantities Waste Generator Contract that the County has with the Department of Health should be \$73,843.93, a 2.4% increase.
3. There should be funding for the School Health Pilot Initiative of \$200,000. This would be new funding from the County.

Explanations of these requests are included in a memorandum to the County forwarded with your other requests.

Solid Waste and Recycling Rates – The impact of the hurricane and tropical storm clean-up costs from 1998 and 1999 caused some concern in reference to the rates. However, the fund balance continues to be strong and it is anticipated that the fund will stay secure. After last year's budget process, the Administration was concerned that there would need to be an increase in the residential collection rate to cover the cost of residential collection, recycling, related programs, and haul out. There has not been an increase in rates for seven years. Efforts have succeeded in stabilizing haul out rates for the past two years and next three years, doing away with various cost elements in the contract with the haul out contractor. The one area of concern was the growing debt of the City of Marathon in reference to the amounts owed the County for tipping fees and haul out services. That debt has been resolved and Marathon is current with its payments. Therefore, it is not necessary to increase the non-ad valorem residential solid waste assessment. This is the eighth year in a row that there has not been an increase in the assessment.

BUDGET SUMMARY

This section will cover a number of issues with which the Board is generally concerned. These issues are highlighted to assist in an understanding of the major issues that are causing major changes.

County Administrator's Budget Message

Presentation February, 2003

In anticipation of changing budget situations, the Administration presented a number of issues to the Board of County Commissioners to help prepare for the budget year. The presentation covered a wide variety of issues including the ones identified below.

The presentation discussed the increasing property values in Monroe County. There has been substantial annual growth in property values and, as a result, ad valorem millage in most areas of the Keys have been reduced over the last four years, with some fluctuation as a result of the municipal incorporations. The most recent figures supplied by the Monroe County Property Appraiser indicate that property values County-wide have increased from \$12.7 billion for fiscal year 2003 to \$14.8 billion for fiscal year 2004, a 17 % overall increase. This means that properties that are not homesteaded may experience a larger tax increase than homesteaded properties.

The presentation identified a number of major issues that were important for this year's budget presentation. Included among those were a level of compensation, proposed retirement system rate increases, group benefits costs, insurance cost increases, the Shadek settlement, how to handle nonprofit funding, state budget issues and the County's loss of revenue, state budget issues and cost shifting to the County, and the County Commission fund balance policy. A summary of those issues showed the Board of County Commissioners the potential impacts on County government, before the Board even began considering County services.

SUMMARY OF ISSUES*

| | Total <u>Estimated Impact</u> | <u>Ad Valorem Funds</u> |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Salary Increases (per 1%) | \$560,000 | \$500,000 |
| FRS Rate Increase | \$2,200,000 | \$2,000,000 |
| Group Benefits | \$4,000,000 | \$3,100,000 |
| Insurance | \$250,000 | \$180,000 |
| Shadek Settlement | \$2,000,000 | \$1,000,000 |
| State Budget Issues – | | |
| Lost of Revenue | | Total Impact of |
| Cost Shifting | | State Issues Unknown |

*This only covers the key areas covered in this presentation. Other issues may arise during the budget process.

There were also discussions in reference to funding of nonprofits, increases in insurance rates, and other issues. A discussion of the group benefits program resulted in a decision to have a special meeting in April of 2003 specifically to address those issues and the costs. The result of that April meeting has been included within this proposed budget.

The February 2003 meeting resulted in a vote by the Board of County Commissioners to instruct the Administration to prepare the proposed draft budget according to the following policies. This proposed budget has been prepared in conjunction with those directions.

1. Draft proposed budget presented to BOCC in July with aggregate millage increase no more than 2.4% (CPI rate) over rollback.
2. Included within this proposed budget would be:
 - a. Compensation increase of 2.4% for all County employees
 - b. State mandated retirement contribution increase
 - c. Human Service Advisory Board total recommendations at this year's level of approximately \$1,065,000 (does not include additional project cost added by BOCC)
 - d. Significant reductions in group benefits program costs and/or increases in revenues

County Administrator's Budget Message

3. Additional costs above the 2.4% would be allowed for new state mandated programs and cost increases (example: Medicaid)
4. Implications
May necessitate cutbacks in services and positions in order to meet goal. Specifics would be presented with July budget proposal.

Appropriations

The proposed appropriations for the coming year are in Section E of the budget book, in a form entitled "Fiscal Year 2004 Proposed Budgetary Cost Summary." On Page E-3 at the bottom line is the overall change from the fiscal year 2003 adopted budget to the fiscal year 2004 proposed budget. That change is from \$269,310,004 to \$286,873,131. That shows a \$17,563,127 increase or 6.5%. As will be seen later, that is the total proposed increase in the budget and certainly not the proposed increase in taxation.

There are a number of major impacts on the \$17,563,127 increase. In summary and in round numbers, the major influences are as follows:

| | | |
|---|---------------------|---|
| Board of County Commissioners | -\$926,000 | |
| Management Services | +\$1,582,000 | |
| Public Safety | -\$880,000 | |
| Public Works | +\$18,147,000 | |
| | | (Includes the \$21 million bond issue proceeds for capital projects. Therefore, there is actually a reduction in operating and other capital expenses.) |
| Growth Management | +\$2,132,000 | |
| | | (Includes \$1,721,000 for the revenue from the five wastewater taxing districts approved by the BOCC.) |
| Community Services | \$-184,000 | |
| Veterans Affairs | \$-56,000 | |
| Key West Airport | \$-814,000 | |
| Fire Rescue Services | \$-667,000 | |
| Elected Officials (Constitutional Officers) | +\$886,000 | |
| Appointed Officials and Boards | <u>\$-1,656,000</u> | |
| | TOTAL | \$17,565,000 |
| | | (Rounded) |

The next section will demonstrate the major changes that are impacting the proposed fiscal year 2004 budget.

Changes in Costs of Operations

Because of the concern of the Board of County Commissioners about expenditure levels, this section will be concerned primarily with the increases and decreases by division for those services directly under the Board of County Commissioners. The information contained below is included in the Budgetary Cost Summary by official/division and the backup material. All of the sections directly under the Board of County Commissioners include 2.4% to fund the compensation program for employees and for the Constitutional Officers.

1. Board of County Commissioners – Because of the manner in which fund accounting is done in government and BOCC policy decisions, the BOCC section of the budget shows a \$-926,437 (-1.7%) decrease. This reflects a \$1,460,488 million increase in budget transfers to cover debt service payments related to the new Capital Bonds.

Also, there is a -\$2,128,233 decrease in reserves due to the timing of the Capital Projects Plan.

County Administrator's Budget Message

2. Management Services Division – The Management Services Division shows an increase of \$1,582,471 (6.3%). This increase is due mostly to the amount contributed to the group insurance program for the coming year. Although the Board of County Commissioners made a \$3.8 million adjustment in the program, the necessity of having a mid-year correction during fiscal year 2003 shows up as an increase in fiscal year 2004.

All other lines within Management Services are reductions except for Technical Services which has a small increase to keep pace with the County's addressing of its growing technology needs.
3. Public Safety Division - The Public Safety Division includes a \$-880,348 decrease (-4.6%). The major changes in this division refer to the adjustments in Public Safety Management wherein some managerial costs are being transferred to the Marathon Airport fund and the Solid Waste fund (both non ad valorem). In addition, there is a \$605,941 decrease in the solid waste operation due to negotiated changes in the haul out contract for waste management.
4. Public Works Division – This budget shows an overall increase of \$18,147,708 (30.6%). The Board should take a close look at the combination of numbers that leads to this bottom line. Much of the budget concerns capital projects, the funds for which have been carried forward if they were not completed during the current year. This could be for road, bridge and bike path construction or any of the facility and park projects in the infrastructure sales tax. The budget includes the \$21+ million bond issue with funds spread across a number of different categories including GENERAL GOVERNMENT CAPITAL PROJECTS and PUBLIC SAFETY CAPITAL PROJECTS. Other increases reflect carryovers and proposed projects within the infrastructure sales tax budget. The Board should be aware that the increases are predominately capital budgets and operations related to capital budgets and there are overall decreases in the general operating categories. That is one of the reasons why a \$21 million bond issue results in only an \$18 million increase.
5. Growth Management Division – The Growth Management budget is \$2,131,837 (28.5%) more than fiscal year 2003. This is due to a number of factors. Most notable is the addition of \$1,721,000 in proceeds from the wastewater taxing districts. Also included are funds to assist with the payment of the Shadek settlement. There is an approximate \$273,000 increase for the Comprehensive Plan funding. There is also a \$211,000 increase in Marine Resources which represent the transfer of one position and additional boating improvement funding.
6. Community Services Division – There is a reduction of \$-184,152 (-3.0%). Because the departments within the Division have run tight budgets for years, the major impacts here represent a change in the impact fees for libraries, which are frequently spent by the County, and some tight operational budgeting by the different departments.
7. Veteran Affairs Department – This Department, which stands as an independent Department, outside of divisions, shows a \$-55,993 decrease (-9.9%). This is primarily the result of strong budgeting controls and the elimination of one position.
8. Key West International Airport – First, the Board should be aware that because of organizational changes, the Marathon Airport is budgeted under the Public Safety Division. In the proposed fiscal year 2004 budget, Key West shows an -\$813,765 decrease (-16.5%). This is due primarily to the availability of airport funds. The challenges for the future are to maintain adequate levels of security as the risk status changes in this country and to prepare the airport for what continue to be security costs and heavy usage.
9. Fire Rescue Services – For the first full budget year, Fire Rescue Services are listed as a separate Department under a new Chief. For the proposed year, this budget, including the Upper Keys Trauma District, shows a reduction of -\$667,277 (-7.9%). This is primarily the result of reductions in EMS Administration, which have occurred over time, usage of less fire impact fees as more fees are being utilized and replacements are not being generated as rapidly and reduction in funds available for the Upper Keys Trauma District.

County Administrator's Budget Message

10. Elected Officials – Budgets for the Constitutional Officers and the County's obligations to the judiciary show an overall increase of \$885,600 (+1.5%). The largest number is in the Sheriff's budget (\$1,073,706), which overall constitutes only a 2.6% increase. Included within the Sheriff's original budget proposal was a request for a 6% salary increase for the Corrections employees. Because of instructions from the Board of County Commissioners, the budget includes a 2.4% salary increase for all the Sheriff's employees as with all other Constitutional and County employees. If the Sheriff were to be granted the additional 3.6%, that amount would be approximately \$244,180.

It should also be noted that funding of Article 5 of the Florida Constitution, in reference to the judicial and related services, is in the process of being revised. Some items are reflected in this budget under Judicial Administration but it is anticipated by the Clerk and the County Administration that the state legislative session in early 2004 will make additional changes that will have a negative impact on the fiscal year 2004 budget's last quarter. It may be necessary for the Administration and the Clerk to address adjustments at that time.

11. Appointed Boards and Officials – The overall reduction in this category is \$-1,656,417 (-7%). This is due primarily to the timing of projections by the Tourist Development Council for the coming year. The County Administrator, the County Attorney and the Medical Examiner have held the line on budgets for the coming year.

Therefore, even though there is an overall \$17,563,127 (6.5%) increase, the major changes are in large categories that are much greater than this increase. For example, it was necessary to budget over \$2 million for the group insurance increase, \$21 million for a bond issue, and \$1,721,000 for the wastewater taxing districts. Therefore, if it had not been for those categories, the total budget figures would have been a reduction. The great majority of those numbers do not rely upon ad valorem taxation for support.

Personnel

Section D, pages D-1 through D-3, shows the proposed Personnel status as of the preparation of the proposed fiscal year 2004 budget. It includes information that was available from the Constitutional Officers.

In past years, the Personnel numbers have been reported on an FTE (Full Time Equivalent) basis. This means that part time employees would be listed at .5 or .4 and the total would count the addition of all the full time and part time employees. However, because of the new budgeting system, the count of positions actually refers to specific positions, no matter whether they are full time positions or part time positions. Therefore, a full time position is listed as one and a part time position is also listed as one. For those who remember the previous personnel statistics, it will seem as though there is a small increase in the number of positions but in actuality the overall numbers are reduced.

Overall, Monroe County has approximately 1,291 positions that work for the Board of County Commissioners and the Constitutional Officers. Of that total, the budgeted positions for fiscal year 2003 under the Board of County Commissioners total 521 or approximately 40% of all employees working for the County (the numbers under the Board do not include grant employees, such as those working for Social Services). County employment under the Board reached 623 positions in fiscal year 1998. That was reduced to 588 positions or about 5.5% in fiscal year 1999. In fiscal year 2000 the number was reduced further to 562 positions or another 4.4% decrease. In the fiscal year 2001 the number was lowered to 507 for an additional 9.7%. In fiscal year 2002, the number was 501 positions, a further decrease of 1% plus. The fiscal year 2003 budget includes a reduction to 499 full time equivalent positions. Therefore, in the last few years the employee count under the Board of County Commissioners has decreased by approximately 20%. In the proposed fiscal year 2004 budget, there is an overall reduction of approximately seven positions under the Board of County Commissioners. (It should be noted that this was done primarily through attrition and not from layoffs.)

Reduction in positions shows in a number of areas. On page D-3, the Board will see a total listing of position adjustments. It will be noticed that there is a lot of reallocation of time for various positions within the

County Administrator's Budget Message

County. Those reallocations do not result in a larger or smaller position count. However, they frequently do result in some ad valorem cost savings as a result of new assignments.

Under the Management Services Division, there is the elimination of one position in Technical Services. Under Marathon Airport there is the elimination of one position and the same is true under Solid Waste.

Under the Public Works Division there is a new part time custodial position to work in the Jackson Square area and there are two new positions, infrastructure sales tax funded, in the County Engineer's office (all approved in fiscal year 2003). These are to deal primarily with capital projects. There is also one additional position in the Road Department. That was transferred during fiscal year 2003.

Under the Growth Management Division, there is the elimination of one position and under the Community Services Division there is the elimination of one position.

Veteran Affairs Department shows the elimination of one position.

Under Elected Officials, the Sheriff's office shows an increase of 14 positions for reinclusion of school crossing guards and two positions that were added for trauma pilots during fiscal year 2004.

The bottom line shows seven additional positions throughout County government. For those portions of County government directly under the control of the County Commission, there is a seven position reduction.

The budget includes a 2.4% allocation for salaries for those positions under the Board of County Commissioners and the Constitutional Officers. The Board is reminded of the Sheriff's proposal for 6% for Correctional Officers and that 2.4% are included in this budget. In addition, the personnel costs within the budget reflect a \$500,000 increase in contributions to the Florida Retirement System. The State mandated that local governments contribute additional for all categories of public employees. The amount identified above for Monroe County, including the Constitutional Officers, represents an approximate \$450,000 increase from ad valorem taxes. This is spread throughout the personnel sections of the County budget.

Major Issues

There are issues of which the Board should be aware in the development of this budget. Some of these have been discussed previously and are repeated here for the sake of putting them together with other issues that are part of the considerations. Some of them are as follows:

1. Fund balances have been included in the budget according to the policy decisions made by the Board of County Commissioners. One exception is in fund 102 (Road and Bridge fund) for which the Board is requested to waive fund balance usage from 70% to 85%.
2. Full cost allocation figures have been applied to next year's budget and are included under the budget of the Board of County Commissioners.
3. The budget includes the adjustment for the rate increase for the internal premium for the group benefits premium as amended during fiscal year 2003. The Board of County Commissioners in April of 2003 determined to make adjustments to the group program. Those adjustments resulted in a \$3.8 million cost decrease and the need not to raise internal department premiums beyond this year's amended level. The rate for fiscal year 2004 is projected to be \$720/month, which includes the subsidies for retirees and dependent coverage.
4. During the previous year's budget discussions, there was consideration of incentives and recruitment and retention issues. The Retention and Recruitment Program has generally been a

County Administrator's Budget Message

success. In addition, the Administration has been working with educational opportunities and incentives based upon obtaining of certifications and specialized training that will benefit the employee and the County. These will continue in the coming year. In fact, over the last few years, the turnover rate for employment has been reduced from about 20% to currently about 7%.

5. The Board of County Commissioners created five municipal service taxing units for the purpose of supporting the cost of wastewater projects in Marathon, Conch Key, Bay Point, Big Coppitt and Key Largo. At present, those taxing districts are proceeding with taxation to be included in the coming fiscal year, with the exception of the Big Coppitt area. The Board of County Commissioners instructed the Administration not to proceed with that taxation until it had an opportunity to see the report from the Florida Keys Aqueduct Authority in reference to a sewerage program for the Big Coppitt, Rockland Key, Geiger Key, and Boca Chica Road service area. If the Board of County Commissioners wishes to institute that taxation this year to support wastewater activities, it should do so during July so that there is enough time to implement the taxation.
6. The Human Services Advisory Board has determined that it will not be completed with its work in time to make specific funding recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners until the end of July. Therefore, the proposed budget includes the same total funding figures as the previous year. The Board of County Commissioners should consider, based upon its vote in February of 2003, maintaining the same total level of funding in the budget. In addition, it should consider those fundings previously identified as requests from other entities for inclusion in this year's budget.

Tax Implications

Included in Section A, starting on page 16, are the millage sheets reflecting this proposed budget. The millage sheets show the trend including fiscal years 2002, 2003 and proposed 2004. The property values that underlie the millage information were derived by the Property Appraiser and show a 16.6% increase in values across the County.

In February of 2003, the Board instructed the Administration to bring in a budget that was no more than 2.4% over the roll back figure. That figure is the millage rate necessary to raise the same amount of taxes next year as in the current year. Because of the increase in property values, the roll back rate came in significantly lower than the current millage rate. The Administration has been able to bring to the Commission the budget with an aggregate 2.36% increase over the roll back rate.

The aggregate figure is a combination of the millage figures throughout the various taxing districts. For example, if the Board will review the "percent over roll back" column under fiscal year 2004, it will see the total County-wide services show a millage increase of 1.71%. The total General Purpose Municipal Service Taxing Unit shows a 33.13% increase over the roll back rate, but actually with a very small dollar amount implication.

The Local Road Patrol Law Enforcement District shows a reduction of over 2% and the Lower and Middle Keys Fire and Ambulance District an increase of 5.6%. The Municipal Service District 6, which is primarily Key Largo, shows a reduction which is due primarily to the volunteer nature of their Fire and EMS services. The aggregate then is 2.36% over the roll back figure.

The second page clearly shows the dollar amounts per area of the County that this proposed budget represents. The biggest increase per \$100,000 taxable value is in unincorporated District 1 part of Monroe County for \$19.33. It is then a \$7.51 increase in District 6, \$10.79 increase in District 7, \$5.86 increase for the Municipalities, and in the City of Layton, which utilizes the services of the Lower and Middle Keys Fire and Ambulance District, a \$14.40 increase. This is significantly less than in past years and is the result of the instructions from the Board of County Commissioners to maintain a low millage rate over roll back.

However, that is not the entire millage story. The second millage sheet shows the impacts of taxation when the five new wastewater districts are included. That brings the total percent over roll back in the aggregate to

County Administrator's Budget Message

5.6%. The Districts do not cover the entire area of Monroe County but do have an impact upon those areas identified. (Please be reminded of the special status of the Big Coppitt area.)

The impact of those wastewater taxing districts can be seen on page B-42. Per \$100,000 value, in Marathon there is an additional \$77 increase, in Conch Key an additional \$70 increase, in Bay Point an additional \$70 increase, in Big Coppitt an additional \$70 increase and in Key Largo an additional \$35 increase. Therefore, the necessity of collecting funds to support the wastewater projects has an impact upon the level of taxation to be paid within those geographic areas. The total increase in taxes to be collected is projected to be nearly \$2 million.

It should be noted on both millage sheets that the Local Health Unit (the State Health Department) is listed at a total taxation of \$296,960. That was a 2.4% increase above the current year. Only within the last couple of days was there an increase above that requested by the Health Department. That is presented to the BOCC in a separate package for consideration along with other funding requests.

General Information

The general fund is divided into a number of categories. The tax collection for the library portion of the fund is relatively close to where it was in the proceeding year. The line "Other" however, includes a wide variety of general fund activities. Impacts in these lines reflect loss of interest income and state shared revenue and increases in insurance costs. The total general fund line indicates how the combination of those two relate.

The next line is the Law Enforcement, Jail, Judicial line. This includes mostly the Sheriff's budget for Countywide services.

There are unincorporated taxing districts that provide municipal services. The General Purpose Municipal Service Taxing Unit (MSTU) includes the entire growth management and fire marshal functions.

The Unincorporated Parks & Beaches District shows an increase for fiscal year 2004. The Board should keep in mind that the total amount is partially the result of the YMCA Contract for Key Largo Community Park (\$40,000).

Next is the Local Road Patrol Law Enforcement District. This covers the municipal policing services that the Sheriff provides in the unincorporated parts of the County.

Another municipal service that shows an increase is in the Lower and Middle Keys Fire & Ambulance District 1, which includes all of unincorporated Monroe County except for Key Largo, which is District 6, and Ocean Reef, which is District 7.

The last number in the lower right hand corner of the page shows a \$2,159,092 million increase in the total amount of taxation to be collected (without the wastewater taxing districts). With these districts included, the amount to be collected is \$4,137,608.

CONCLUSION

It should be noted at this time that this budget does not include major new proposals for programs or services because of the difficult taxation situation and the increase of costs in various parts of the County budget (such as group benefits) and the impact of State mandates (such as retirement contributions). Even with the reduction in the number of positions, there is confidence that the level of services can be maintained.

One area that should be looked at if there are funds available at the end of the budget process is additional Fire Rescue/EMS equipment. The Chief is proposing a multi-year program to upgrade various types of equipment and it is necessary for the County to continue to support those activities.

As has been happening for generations, state and local governments are now going through a negative, economic cycle. One day that cycle will change, hopefully within the next year or two, and it will be possible to expand and improve services and address some new issues. The Administration is prepared to work with the Board

County Administrator's Budget Message

of County Commissioners to adjust this budget to meet its goals and policies and to help prepare for more positive years in the future.

James L. Roberts
County Administrator
July, 2003

Monroe County Board of County Commissioners
2004 Millage Rates- Proposed Budget

7/15/2003:15 PM

| Description | Fiscal Year 2002 Adopted | | | | Fiscal Year 2003 Adopted | | | | Fiscal Year 2004 Proposed | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| | Rolled-Back Rate | Millage Rate | Percent Over Rolled-back | Total Ad Valorem Tax | Rolled-Back Rate | Millage Rate | Percent Over Rolled-back | Total Ad Valorem Tax | Rolled-Back Rate | Millage Rate | Percent Over Prev. Year | Percent Over Rolled-back | Total Ad Valorem Tax | Total Tax Over/(Under) Last Year |
| County-wide Services | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General Fund: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Library | 0.1552 | 0.1551 | -0.06% | 1,755,801 | 0.1400 | 0.1422 | 1.57% | 1,806,642 | 0.1236 | 0.0000 | -100.0% | -100.00% | 0 | (1,806,642) |
| Other | 1.0638 | 1.1878 | 11.66% | 13,444,066 | 1.0720 | 1.1053 | 3.11% | 14,043,726 | 0.9609 | 1.1295 | 2.2% | 17.55% | 16,696,942 | 2,653,216 |
| Total General Fund | 1.2190 | 1.3429 | 10.16% | 15,199,867 | 1.2120 | 1.2475 | 2.93% | 15,850,368 | 1.0845 | 1.1295 | -9.5% | 4.15% | 16,696,942 | 846,574 |
| Law Enforcement, Jail, Judicial | 2.5285 | 2.7722 | 9.64% | 31,376,293 | 2.5018 | 2.6752 | 6.93% | 33,990,131 | 2.3256 | 2.3389 | -12.6% | 0.57% | 34,574,634 | 584,503 |
| Local Health Unit | 0.0251 | 0.0256 | 1.99% | 290,000 | 0.0231 | 0.0228 | -1.30% | 290,000 | 0.0198 | 0.0201 | -11.8% | 1.52% | 296,960 | 6,960 |
| Total County-wide Services | 3.7726 | 4.1407 | 9.76% | 46,866,160 | 3.7369 | 3.9455 | 5.58% | 50,130,499 | 3.4299 | 3.4885 | -11.6% | 1.71% | 51,568,536 | 1,438,037 |
| Municipal Services | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General Purpose Municipal Service (MSTU): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Planning, Building, Code Enf, Fire Marshal | 0.2952 | 0.1108 | -62.47% | 577,503 | 0.0991 | 0.0345 | -65.19% | 203,426 | 0.0294 | 0.0282 | -18.3% | -4.08% | 197,733 | (5,693) |
| Parks And Beaches | 0.2276 | 0.1854 | -18.54% | 965,825 | 0.1658 | 0.1786 | 7.72% | 1,053,577 | 0.1526 | 0.2141 | 19.9% | 40.30% | 1,499,878 | 446,301 |
| Municipal Policing | 0.7122 | 0.0000 | -100.00% | 0 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | #DIV/0! | 0 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | #DIV/0! | #DIV/0! | 0 | 0 |
| Total General Purpose MSTU | 1.2350 | 0.2962 | -76.02% | 1,543,328 | 0.2649 | 0.2131 | -19.55% | 1,257,003 | 0.1820 | 0.2423 | 13.7% | 33.13% | 1,697,611 | 440,608 |
| Local Road Patrol Law Enforcement District | 0.0000 | 0.6321 | N/A | 3,293,223 | 0.5653 | 0.5549 | -1.84% | 3,274,005 | 0.4740 | 0.4630 | -16.6% | -2.32% | 3,243,292 | (30,713) |
| Fire And Ambulance Districts: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lower & Middle Keys Fire & Ambulance District 1 | 1.6911 | 1.7245 | 1.98% | 4,178,858 | 1.5780 | 1.8294 | 15.93% | 4,882,591 | 1.5141 | 1.5995 | -12.6% | 5.64% | 5,241,668 | 359,077 |
| Municipal Service District 6 | 0.5976 | 0.6641 | 11.13% | 825,407 | 0.5800 | 0.6173 | 6.43% | 890,386 | 0.5072 | 0.4744 | -23.1% | -6.47% | 842,469 | (47,917) |
| Wastewater Districts: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Marathon Municipal Service Taxing Unit | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | N/A | 0 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | N/A | 0 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | N/A | N/A | 0 | 0 |
| Conch Key Municipal Service Taxing Unit | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | N/A | 0 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | N/A | 0 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | N/A | N/A | 0 | 0 |
| Bay Point Municipal Service Taxing Unit | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | N/A | 0 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | N/A | 0 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | N/A | N/A | 0 | 0 |
| Big Coppitt Municipal Service Taxing Unit | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | N/A | 0 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | N/A | 0 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | N/A | N/A | 0 | 0 |
| Key Largo Municipal Service Taxing Unit | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | N/A | 0 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | N/A | 0 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | N/A | N/A | 0 | 0 |
| Total Municipal Services, Lower & Middle Keys | 2.9261 | 2.6528 | -9.34% | | 2.4082 | 2.5974 | 7.86% | | 2.1701 | 2.3048 | -11.3% | 6.21% | | |
| Total Municipal Services, District 6 | 1.8326 | 1.5924 | -13.11% | | 1.4102 | 1.3853 | -1.77% | | 1.1632 | 1.1797 | -14.8% | 1.42% | | |
| Aggregate | 4.7725 | 5.0102 | 4.98% | 56,706,976 | 4.5179 | 4.7565 | 5.28% | 60,434,484 | 4.1366 | 4.2342 | -11.0% | 2.36% | 62,593,576 | 2,159,092 |

Ad Valorem Millage Summary

Proposed Fiscal Year 2004

| | Rollback Millage | Millage | % over Rollback | Taxes per \$100,000 of taxable value | Increase per \$100,000 of taxable value |
|---|---------------------|---------|--------------------|--|---|
| Unincorporated, Dist 1 | | | | | |
| (Unincorporated area from Stock Island to Tavernier from Mile Marker 4 to 95) | | | | | |
| Countywide Services | 3.4299 | 3.4885 | 1.71% | \$348.85 | \$5.86 |
| Lower & Middle Keys Fire & Ambulance | 1.5141 | 1.5995 | 5.64% | \$159.95 | \$8.54 |
| Planning, Building, Code Enf, Fire Marshal | 0.0294 | 0.0282 | -4.08% | \$2.82 | -\$0.12 |
| Parks & Beaches | 0.1526 | 0.2141 | 40.30% | \$21.41 | \$6.15 |
| Local Road Patrol | 0.4740 | 0.4630 | -2.32% | \$46.30 | -\$1.10 |
| Total | 5.6000 | 5.7933 | 3.45% | \$579.33 | \$19.33 |

Unincorporated, Dist 6

(Mile Marker 95 up US 1 to County line and up 905 to intersection of Card Sound Road)

| | | | | | |
|--|--------|--------|--------|----------|---------|
| Countywide Services | 3.4299 | 3.4885 | 1.71% | \$348.85 | \$5.86 |
| Fire & Ambulance, Dist 6 | 0.5072 | 0.4744 | -6.47% | \$47.44 | -\$3.28 |
| Planning, Building, Code Enf, Fire Marshal | 0.0294 | 0.0282 | -4.08% | \$2.82 | -\$0.12 |
| Parks & Beaches | 0.1526 | 0.2141 | 40.30% | \$21.41 | \$6.15 |
| Local Road Patrol | 0.4740 | 0.4630 | -2.32% | \$46.30 | -\$1.10 |
| Total | 4.5931 | 4.6682 | 1.64% | \$466.82 | \$7.51 |

Unincorporated, Dist 7

(From intersection of 905 and Card Sound Road up Card Sound Road to the County line)

| | | | | | |
|--|--------|--------|--------|----------|---------|
| Countywide Services | 3.4299 | 3.4885 | 1.71% | \$348.85 | \$5.86 |
| Planning, Building, Code Enf, Fire Marshal | 0.0294 | 0.0282 | -4.08% | \$2.82 | -\$0.12 |
| Parks & Beaches | 0.1526 | 0.2141 | 40.30% | \$21.41 | \$6.15 |
| Local Road Patrol | 0.4740 | 0.4630 | -2.32% | \$46.30 | -\$1.10 |
| Total | 4.0859 | 4.1938 | 2.64% | \$419.38 | \$10.79 |

Key West, Key Colony Beach, Islamorada, & Marathon

| | | | | | |
|---------------------|--------|--------|-------|----------|--------|
| Countywide Services | 3.4299 | 3.4885 | 1.71% | \$348.85 | \$5.86 |
|---------------------|--------|--------|-------|----------|--------|

Layton

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------|--------|-------|----------|---------|
| Countywide Services | 3.4299 | 3.4885 | 1.71% | \$348.85 | \$5.86 |
| Lower & Middle Keys Fire & Ambulance | 1.5141 | 1.5995 | 5.64% | \$159.95 | \$8.54 |
| Total | 4.9440 | 5.0880 | 2.91% | \$508.80 | \$14.40 |

Areas located within Wastewater Districts

Marathon

| | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--------|--------|-------|----------|--------|
| Countywide Services Subtotal | 3.4299 | 3.4885 | 1.71% | \$348.85 | \$5.86 |
| Wastewater | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | n/a | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| Total | 3.4299 | 3.4885 | 1.71% | \$348.85 | \$5.86 |

Monroe County Board of County Commissioners
2004 Millage Rates- Proposed Budget

7/15/2003:17 PM

| Description | Fiscal Year 2002 Adopted | | | | Fiscal Year 2003 Adopted | | | | Fiscal Year 2004 Proposed | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| | Rolled-Back Rate | Millage Rate | Percent Over Rolled-back | Total Ad Valorem Tax | Rolled-Back Rate | Millage Rate | Percent Over Rolled-back | Total Ad Valorem Tax | Rolled-Back Rate | Millage Rate | Percent Over Prev. Year | Percent Over Rolled-back | Total Ad Valorem Tax | Total Tax Over/(Under) Last Year |
| County-wide Services | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General Fund: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Library | 0.1552 | 0.1551 | -0.06% | 1,755,801 | 0.1400 | 0.1422 | 1.57% | 1,806,642 | 0.1236 | 0.0000 | -100.0% | -100.00% | 0 | (1,806,642) |
| Other | 1.0638 | 1.1878 | 11.66% | 13,444,066 | 1.0720 | 1.1053 | 3.11% | 14,043,726 | 0.9609 | 1.1295 | 2.2% | 17.55% | 16,696,942 | 2,653,216 |
| Total General Fund | 1.2190 | 1.3429 | 10.16% | 15,199,867 | 1.2120 | 1.2475 | 2.93% | 15,850,368 | 1.0845 | 1.1295 | -9.5% | 4.15% | 16,696,942 | 846,574 |
| Law Enforcement, Jail, Judicial | 2.5285 | 2.7722 | 9.64% | 31,376,293 | 2.5018 | 2.6752 | 6.93% | 33,990,131 | 2.3256 | 2.3389 | -12.6% | 0.57% | 34,574,634 | 584,503 |
| Local Health Unit | 0.0251 | 0.0256 | 1.99% | 290,000 | 0.0231 | 0.0228 | -1.30% | 290,000 | 0.0198 | 0.0201 | -11.8% | 1.52% | 296,960 | 6,960 |
| Total County-wide Services | 3.7726 | 4.1407 | 9.76% | 46,866,160 | 3.7369 | 3.9455 | 5.58% | 50,130,499 | 3.4299 | 3.4885 | -11.6% | 1.71% | 51,568,536 | 1,438,037 |
| Municipal Services | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General Purpose Municipal Service (MSTU): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Planning, Building, Code Enf, Fire Marshal | 0.2952 | 0.1108 | -62.47% | 577,503 | 0.0991 | 0.0345 | -65.19% | 203,426 | 0.0294 | 0.0282 | -18.3% | -4.08% | 197,733 | (5,693) |
| Parks And Beaches | 0.2276 | 0.1854 | -18.54% | 965,825 | 0.1658 | 0.1786 | 7.72% | 1,053,577 | 0.1526 | 0.2141 | 19.9% | 40.30% | 1,499,878 | 446,301 |
| Municipal Policing | 0.7122 | 0.0000 | -100.00% | 0 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | #DIV/0! | 0 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | #DIV/0! | #DIV/0! | 0 | 0 |
| Total General Purpose MSTU | 1.2350 | 0.2962 | -76.02% | 1,543,328 | 0.2649 | 0.2131 | -19.55% | 1,257,003 | 0.1820 | 0.2423 | 13.7% | 33.13% | 1,697,611 | 440,608 |
| Local Road Patrol Law Enforcement District | 0.0000 | 0.6321 | N/A | 3,293,223 | 0.5653 | 0.5549 | -1.84% | 3,274,005 | 0.4740 | 0.4630 | -16.6% | -2.32% | 3,243,292 | (30,713) |
| Fire And Ambulance Districts: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lower & Middle Keys Fire & Ambulance District 1 | 1.6911 | 1.7245 | 1.98% | 4,178,858 | 1.5780 | 1.8294 | 15.93% | 4,882,591 | 1.5141 | 1.5995 | -12.6% | 5.64% | 5,241,668 | 359,077 |
| Municipal Service District 6 | 0.5976 | 0.6641 | 11.13% | 825,407 | 0.5800 | 0.6173 | 6.43% | 890,386 | 0.5072 | 0.4744 | -23.1% | -6.47% | 842,469 | (47,917) |
| Wastewater Districts: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Marathon Municipal Service Taxing Unit | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | N/A | 0 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | N/A | 0 | 0.0000 | 0.7700 | N/A | N/A | 994,000 | 994,000 |
| Conch Key Municipal Service Taxing Unit | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | N/A | 0 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | N/A | 0 | 0.0000 | 0.7000 | N/A | N/A | 9,961 | 9,961 |
| Bay Point Municipal Service Taxing Unit | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | N/A | 0 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | N/A | 0 | 0.0000 | 0.7000 | N/A | N/A | 39,775 | 39,775 |
| Big Coppitt Municipal Service Taxing Unit | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | N/A | 0 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | N/A | 0 | 0.0000 | 0.7000 | N/A | N/A | 135,180 | 135,180 |
| Key Largo Municipal Service Taxing Unit | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | N/A | 0 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | N/A | 0 | 0.0000 | 0.3500 | N/A | N/A | 799,600 | 799,600 |
| Total Municipal Services, Lower & Middle Keys | 2.9261 | 2.6528 | -9.34% | | 2.4082 | 2.5974 | 7.86% | | 2.1701 | 2.3048 | -11.3% | 6.21% | | |
| Total Municipal Services, District 6 | 1.8326 | 1.5924 | -13.11% | | 1.4102 | 1.3853 | -1.77% | | 1.1632 | 1.1797 | -14.8% | 1.42% | | |
| Aggregate | 4.7725 | 5.0102 | 4.98% | 56,706,976 | 4.5179 | 4.7565 | 5.28% | 60,434,484 | 4.1366 | 4.3681 | -8.2% | 5.60% | 64,572,092 | 4,137,608 |

Ad Valorem Millage Summary

Proposed Fiscal Year 2004

| | Rollback Millage | Millage | % over Rollback | Taxes per \$100,000 of taxable value | Increase per \$100,000 of taxable value |
|---|---------------------|---------|--------------------|--|---|
| Unincorporated, Dist 1 | | | | | |
| (Unincorporated area from Stock Island to Tavernier from Mile Marker 4 to 95) | | | | | |
| Countywide Services | 3.4299 | 3.4885 | 1.71% | \$348.85 | \$5.86 |
| Lower & Middle Keys Fire & Ambulance | 1.5141 | 1.5995 | 5.64% | \$159.95 | \$8.54 |
| Planning, Building, Code Enf, Fire Marshal | 0.0294 | 0.0282 | -4.08% | \$2.82 | -\$0.12 |
| Parks & Beaches | 0.1526 | 0.2141 | 40.30% | \$21.41 | \$6.15 |
| Local Road Patrol | 0.4740 | 0.4630 | -2.32% | \$46.30 | -\$1.10 |
| Total | 5.6000 | 5.7933 | 3.45% | \$579.33 | \$19.33 |

Unincorporated, Dist 6

(Mile Marker 95 up US 1 to County line and up 905 to intersection of Card Sound Road)

| | | | | | |
|--|--------|--------|--------|----------|---------|
| Countywide Services | 3.4299 | 3.4885 | 1.71% | \$348.85 | \$5.86 |
| Fire & Ambulance, Dist 6 | 0.5072 | 0.4744 | -6.47% | \$47.44 | -\$3.28 |
| Planning, Building, Code Enf, Fire Marshal | 0.0294 | 0.0282 | -4.08% | \$2.82 | -\$0.12 |
| Parks & Beaches | 0.1526 | 0.2141 | 40.30% | \$21.41 | \$6.15 |
| Local Road Patrol | 0.4740 | 0.4630 | -2.32% | \$46.30 | -\$1.10 |
| Total | 4.5931 | 4.6682 | 1.64% | \$466.82 | \$7.51 |

Unincorporated, Dist 7

(From intersection of 905 and Card Sound Road up Card Sound Road to the County line)

| | | | | | |
|--|--------|--------|--------|----------|---------|
| Countywide Services | 3.4299 | 3.4885 | 1.71% | \$348.85 | \$5.86 |
| Planning, Building, Code Enf, Fire Marshal | 0.0294 | 0.0282 | -4.08% | \$2.82 | -\$0.12 |
| Parks & Beaches | 0.1526 | 0.2141 | 40.30% | \$21.41 | \$6.15 |
| Local Road Patrol | 0.4740 | 0.4630 | -2.32% | \$46.30 | -\$1.10 |
| Total | 4.0859 | 4.1938 | 2.64% | \$419.38 | \$10.79 |

Key West, Key Colony Beach, Islamorada, & Marathon

| | | | | | |
|---------------------|--------|--------|-------|----------|--------|
| Countywide Services | 3.4299 | 3.4885 | 1.71% | \$348.85 | \$5.86 |
|---------------------|--------|--------|-------|----------|--------|

Layton

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------|--------|-------|----------|---------|
| Countywide Services | 3.4299 | 3.4885 | 1.71% | \$348.85 | \$5.86 |
| Lower & Middle Keys Fire & Ambulance | 1.5141 | 1.5995 | 5.64% | \$159.95 | \$8.54 |
| Total | 4.9440 | 5.0880 | 2.91% | \$508.80 | \$14.40 |

Areas located within Wastewater Districts

Marathon

| | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|----------|---------|
| Countywide Services Subtotal | 3.4299 | 3.4885 | 1.71% | \$348.85 | \$5.86 |
| Wastewater | 0.0000 | 0.7700 | n/a | \$77.00 | \$77.00 |
| Total | 3.4299 | 4.2585 | 24.16% | \$425.85 | \$82.86 |

Ad Valorem Millage Summary

Proposed Fiscal Year 2004

Conch Key

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|----------|---------|
| Unincorporated, Dist 1 Subtotal | 5.6000 | 5.7933 | 3.45% | \$579.33 | \$19.33 |
| Wastewater | 0.0000 | 0.7000 | n/a | \$70.00 | \$70.00 |
| Total | 5.6000 | 6.4933 | 15.95% | \$649.33 | \$89.33 |

Bay Point

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|----------|---------|
| Unincorporated, Dist 1 Subtotal | 5.6000 | 5.7933 | 3.45% | \$579.33 | \$19.33 |
| Wastewater | 0.0000 | 0.7000 | n/a | \$70.00 | \$70.00 |
| Total | 5.6000 | 6.4933 | 15.95% | \$649.33 | \$89.33 |

Big Coppitt

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|----------|---------|
| Unincorporated, Dist 1 Subtotal | 5.6000 | 5.7933 | 3.45% | \$579.33 | \$19.33 |
| Wastewater | 0.0000 | 0.7000 | n/a | \$70.00 | \$70.00 |
| Total | 5.6000 | 6.4933 | 15.95% | \$649.33 | \$89.33 |

Key Largo

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|--------|-------|----------|---------|
| Unincorporated, Dist 6 Subtotal | 4.5931 | 4.6682 | 1.64% | \$466.82 | \$7.51 |
| Wastewater | 0.0000 | 0.3500 | n/a | \$35.00 | \$35.00 |
| Total | 4.5931 | 5.0182 | 9.26% | \$501.82 | \$42.51 |